

Appl. No. 09/527,424
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 17, 2003

[10191/1333]

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-24, 26-27 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,000,004 to Fukumoto (the "Fukumoto reference"). For at least the following reasons, the Fukumoto reference does not anticipate Claims 1, 3-12, 14-24, and 26-27, as well as newly added Claims 33-38.

Amended Claim 1 recites:

A method of programming information in a memory arrangement of a computer, comprising the steps of:
providing an identifier into an area of the memory arrangement that is to be programmed, the identifier identifying a correct programming of the memory arrangement; and
altering the identifier in the memory arrangement before programming the information.

The Fukumoto reference does not disclose "providing an identifier into an area of the memory arrangement that is to be programmed, the identifier identifying a correct programming of the memory arrangement." The Fukumoto reference merely describes providing a block protect (BP) storage region and an erase complete (EC) storage region. Neither the BP nor the EC information identifies a correct programming of the memory arrangement.

The BP storage region is provided "in order to protect the data stored in each block. In this case, if the BP data is stored in the BP data storage region, then the erase and the write of the data from/into the block are prohibited in principle." Fukumoto, col. 4, ll. 40-43. Thus, the BP data does not serve to identify a correct programming of the memory arrangement.

The data in the EC storage area is erased during an erase operation. Fukumoto, col. 14, ll. 9-11. After the erase operation is complete, the EC data is written to the EC storage area. Fukumoto, col. 14, ll. 11-13. The EC data is only rewritten during an erase operation. Fukumoto, col. 13-15. Thus, the EC storage data does not serve to identify a correct programming of the memory arrangement.

Amended Claims 12, 24, and 27 recite similar features regarding an identifier identifying a correct programming of the memory arrangement. For at least the reasons stated above, the Fukumoto reference does not disclose each and every feature recited in independent Claims 1, 12, 24, and 27, as well as dependent Claims 3-11, 14-13, 26, and 29-32. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 13, 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fukumoto reference. Claims 2, 13, 25, and 28 depend from Claims 1, 12, 24, and 27,

Appl. No. 09/527,424
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 17, 2003

[10191/1333]

respectively. Since the Fukumoto reference does not anticipate Claims 1, 12, 24 and 27 as described above, the Fukumoto reference cannot render dependent Claims 2, 13, 25, and 28 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claim 33 recites:

A method of erasing information in a memory arrangement of a computer, comprising:
 providing an identifier into an area of the memory arrangement that is to be erased, the identifier identifying a correct erasing of the memory arrangement; and
 altering the identifier in the memory arrangement before erasing the information.

The Fukumoto reference does not disclose "altering the identifier in the memory arrangement before erasing the information." According to the Fukumoto reference, the EC storage area is erased during the erase operation, and the data stored in the EC storage area is rewritten only when the erase operation is performed. Fukumoto, col. 14, ll. 9-15. Therefore, the EC storage data is not altered before erasing the information. Since the Fukumoto reference does not disclose at least this feature, the Fukumoto reference does not anticipate new Claim 33.

New Claim 34 recites a similar feature regarding altering the identifier before erasing the information. For at least the reasons described above, the Fukumoto reference does not anticipate new Claim 34. It is respectfully submitted that new Claims 33 and 34 are in condition for allowance.

New Claim 35 recites:

A method of erasing and programming information in a memory arrangement of a computer, comprising:
 providing an identifier into an area of the memory arrangement that is to be erased and programmed, the identifier identifying a correct erasing and programming of the memory arrangement; and
 altering the identifier in the memory arrangement before erasing and programming the information.

As discussed above, the Fukumoto reference does not disclose an identifier identifying a correct programming of the memory arrangement. Furthermore, the Fukumoto reference does not disclose an identifier identifying a correct erasing and programming of the memory arrangement. Thus, the Fukumoto reference does not anticipate Claim 35.

New Claims 36-38 recite similar features regarding an identifier identifying a correct programming of the memory arrangement. For at least the reasons described above, the

Appl. No. 09/527,424
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 17, 2003

[10191/1333]

Fukumoto reference also does not anticipate new Claims 36-38. It is respectfully submitted that new Claims 35-38 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 12/17/03

By: Richard L. Mayer
Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. Reg. No. 22,490
KENYON & KENYON
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

167
R. no.
36,197)